

**REPORT**

**Marrakech,  
Morocco  
9-11 December  
2002**

# **Fourteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations**

Prepared by the European Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO)



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**



REPORT OF THE  
FOURTEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG  
REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS

Marrakech, Morocco 9-11 December 2002

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction, should be addressed to the Director, Information Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Fourteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

*Appendix I*        Recommendations of the 14<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation among RPPOs

*Appendix II*        Role and functions of the Technical Consultation

*Appendix III*        List of Participants

*Appendix IV*        Agenda



## **Opening**

The meeting was opened by Mr Smith (EPPO), who welcomed participants to Marrakech on behalf of EPPO, stressing that this was the first time that a Technical Consultation had been held in the Near East or in Africa. Mr Hilali (EPPO) greeted the Technical Consultation on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture of Morocco, and Mr Jones (IPPC Secretariat) on behalf of FAO. Mr Ashby (EPPO) was elected as Chairman of the meeting and Mrs Olembo (IAPSC) as Vice-Chairman.

### **1. Report of 13<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation**

Mr Jones noted that several of the points raised by the 13<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation had been duly reported to the Fourth ICPM in March 2002, especially the points on use of simple language in ISPMs and the problems concerning future availability of methyl bromide. The recommendations of the 13<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation for recognition of RPPOs had been adopted by the ICPM. , point 11 was developed into the international standard. The Chairman noted that a timetable for coordinated activities had been agreed (point 27) and called for its review. Most of the points had been duly undertaken, and were now covered by the agenda of the 14<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation. The provision of experts for a PRA on South American leaf blight of rubber, for APPPC, remained open. The question of a regional PPPO for generic HTFA treatment against fruit flies was held over to the next Technical Consultation. Mr McDonell (NAPPO) noted that information on the Regional Standards of NAPPO and EPPO was provided to the present meeting but stressed that all RPPOs should make such information transparently available, especially through their websites.

### **2. Present and future for RPPOs: situation of NEPPO**

#### **2.1 Role and functions of the Technical Consultation**

Mr Jones presented an IPPC Secretariat discussion paper on "Position of the Technical Consultation in IPPC Work Programme Priorities". He stressed that the ICPM should be clearly informed of the benefits of holding Technical Consultations between RPPOs and of the role of the IPPC Secretariat in these meetings. Mr McDonell noted that the importance of the Technical Consultations was recognized in the IPPC and Mr Lopian (EPPO; Vice-Chairman of the ICPM) specified further that the IPPC Secretariat was required to cooperate with the RPPOs in developing ISPMs and to hold Technical Consultation meetings "regularly" (though it was not specified how often).

Mr Ivess (APPPC) recalled that the Technical Consultations had been very important in the past in developing the present ICPM system, but that they now needed to find a new role. Mr Lopian agreed and added that there were now doubts within the ICPM system whether the matters handled by the Technical Consultation (at least at recent meetings) were of sufficient substance to justify holding such costly international meetings. The ICPM was also concerned that the IPPC Secretariat was already very short of funds and staff to organize its main activities. Mr Foliaki (PPPO), however, believed that the IPPC budget would be increased in the face of the existing crisis, and that this should not affect the long-term situation of the Technical Consultations. It was noted that, with the exception of support from FAO for APPPC (and eventually CPPC) and for one person from the IPPC Secretariat, the Technical Consultations are entirely funded by the host and participant RPPOs.

Mr McDonell thought that the creation of the ICPM had not reduced the importance of the Technical Consultations, especially now that the meetings were held in different regions. Mr Ivess agreed that they made it possible to compare regional problems and to discuss them between representatives from countries with different level of development. The Vice-Chairman stressed that the Technical Consultation meetings were the only opportunity for experts from different RPPOs to meet and discuss their problems. Mr Pemberton added that RPPOs were in reality working at a global level and that they needed a global forum. Interaction between RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat should be reciprocal. Mr Shen (APPPC) also stressed that the IPPC Secretariat benefited from exchange of information with RPPOs in the Technical Consultation.

Mr Smith stressed again that cooperation between the IPPC Secretariat and the RPPOs was principally intended to concern the objectives of the IPPC and the development of ISPMs. Mr McDonell agreed that the RPPOs were active in making proposals and coordinating comments on ISPMs under development. Mr Ivess added that this role extended also to programmes for the implementation of ISPMs in the regions. Mr Pemberton (EPPPO) believed that the Technical Consultation provided a forum for exchange of opinions on standards at the consultation stage, and it should be timed to allow this. Mr Smith proposed that the regular date should revert to beginning/middle of October.

Finally, the Technical Consultation decided to present to the ICPM a document (Appendix I) recalling the past activities of the Technical Consultation and proposing its future role. It invited the ICPM to

- endorse the continuation of Technical Consultation meetings on a yearly basis (preferably in October), with participation of the IPPC Secretariat
- make proposals for the annual programme of the Technical Consultation within the framework of the Work Programme of the ICPM.

## **2.2 NEPPO**

Mr Smith outlined the situation, by reference to an IPPC Secretariat paper on "History and Status of the Near East Plant Protection Organization", stressing that the Near East region needed an RPPO, that the NEPPO Agreement had been adopted by 17 Near East countries in 1993, but that it would come into force only when 10 of those countries ratified it or acceded to it. Mr Pemberton suggested that the Technical Consultation should urge the countries concerned to accede to the NEPPO Agreement. He believed that creation of NEPPO would strengthen the net of RPPOs. Mr Lopian suggested that it was the RPPOs present at the Technical Consultation that could take the initiative with their members that were also potential NEPPO members. Mr McDonell wondered, however, what was the interest of these countries to join a new RPPO when they were already members of another. Mr Smith answered that countries were free to join several RPPOs and many had already done so. The Chairman proposed to prepare a letter to potential NEPPO countries on behalf of the Technical Consultation. The Vice-Chairman suggested that this would be better done through their representatives at FAO. Mr Hilali reported the unchecked information that Libya had already acceded to the NEPPO Agreement.

Finally, the Technical Consultation decided to urge all IPPC Contracting Parties in the Near East Region that were not yet parties to the NEPPO Agreement to ratify, or accede to, the Agreement as soon as possible so that it could rapidly come into force and NEPPO could become an active RPPO. The Technical Consultation stressed that the existence of NEPPO would greatly facilitate phytosanitary cooperation between the countries of the Near East Region and that their phytosanitary interests and concerns could, as appropriate, be represented by NEPPO at future Technical Consultations and other international meetings. The Technical Consultation also urged the ICPM to support the development of NEPPO.

## **3. Future of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications. Work programme**

Mr Jones recalled the decision of the ICPM, in reaction to the concerns of the 13<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation regarding diminishing access to methyl bromide, that a relevant paper be prepared for discussion by the next ICPM. This paper had now been drafted for the IPPC Secretariat by a consultant (Dr S. Ogden), under the title "The future of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications". The consultant had also drafted, for the IPPC Secretariat, a "Work programme for promoting the minimization of phytosanitary uses of methyl bromide". The IPPC Secretariat also stressed that the decisions of the ICPM on this matter had to be rapidly made known to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel of the Montréal Protocol, if they were to have any effect. The Technical Consultation expressed its appreciation of the documentation presented on this subject, which had been excellently prepared. Mr Pemberton believed that the term QPS (quarantine and pre-shipment), used in the Montréal Protocol, was not correct and that it was necessary to separate "quarantine" (therefore justified) from "pre-shipment" (not necessarily justified). Messrs Petpisit (APPPC), de Hoop (EPPPO) and McDonell stressed that the ICPM had first to give its clear support to the reduction of all unnecessary use of methyl bromide. They agreed with the approach of the consultant, who



suggested that "necessary" uses should be individually identified, within the framework of QPS uses. Mr Lopian expected that all uses of methyl bromide would eventually be prohibited by international agreement, and for that reason did not support any mention of methyl bromide fumigation in ISPMs. In any case, the present restrictions would lead to the disappearance of this chemical from the market. Other participants did not agree, and believed that certain essential uses would be retained. They accepted, however, that even in plant quarantine, some uses of methyl bromide were not justified, since there were alternative measures available with the same effect. Mr Arocena (COSAVE) had misgivings about the general approach which was being followed, since it could conflict with countries' sovereign rights under the Montréal protocol to use methyl bromide for QPS treatments.

Finally, the Technical Consultation decided to make the following recommendations to the ICPM. It welcomed the consultant's paper prepared for the IPPC Secretariat on "The future of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications", and agreed in principle with its conclusions, taking into account the sovereign right of countries to meet their obligations under the Montréal protocol. In a lengthy discussion, the Technical Consultation noted:

- the lack of alternatives to methyl bromide which continues to be problematic despite many research initiatives in the past few years;
- the need for technical justification of existing phytosanitary uses of methyl bromide;
- the fact that availability of methyl bromide is likely to be progressively more limited in future, whether for reasons of cost and supply, or through the further application and development of the Montréal Protocol.

The Technical Consultation noted the work programme which was proposed by the IPPC Secretariat for promoting the minimization of phytosanitary uses of methyl bromide and generally supported its main elements. It suggested that the elements concerned with alternative in-transit treatments and with reducing the incidence of emergency action fumigation should be more specifically focussed on methyl bromide. It proposed that, where the work programme proposes new ISPMs, these should be integrated into the general standard-setting programme of the ICPM with provision that the points relating to methyl bromide should be adequately addressed in them. It strongly suggested that the ICPM should identify the issues of immediate importance which should be made known to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel of the Montréal Protocol in 2003, by preparation of a special document. It encouraged phytosanitary authorities in regions and countries to establish closer contact the authorities responsible for the Montréal Protocol, in order to promote the ICPM policy on methyl bromide. These recommendations were made with reservations from one RPPPO.

#### **4. Risk analysis for low mobility pests on products for consumption**

Mr Arocena presented a COSAVE proposal for a supplement to ISPM no 11 on "Risk analysis for low mobility pests on products for consumption document". He explained that this concerned, for example, scales, mealybugs or similar pests with a limited ability for natural spread, whose presence on consignments of, for example, fruits presented a low risk. Messrs Smith and Lopian noted that most pathogens automatically fell into this category. In Europe, the risk is considered zero for the import of most fruits for consumption, and no phytosanitary requirements are made for them. Mr Suma (PPPO) noted that some fruits intended for consumption could be occasionally used for planting, for example, pineapples. Mr Zweigert (IAPSC) commented that many importing countries are not currently using PRA to establish their requirements. As a result, they may be making unnecessarily strict requirements for low-mobility pests on fruits. Several participants agreed that it was necessary, in pest risk management, to take account of the low risk of spread from products for consumption or processing. In principle, ISPM no 11 allows for this already, but it would be useful for a paper to make this clear.

In conclusion, the Technical Consultation noted COSAVE's proposal for a supplement to ISPM no 11, to clarify PRA procedures in the case where low mobility pests are carried on fruits and vegetables in international trade. It concluded that this case was already adequately covered by the text of ISPM No 11, but noted that failure to implement ISPM No 11 adequately was giving rise to the application of

unnecessarily restrictive measures for this pest/commodity combination. It drew the attention of the ICPM to this problem.

## **5. Funding of the IPPC Secretariat: EPPO Council resolution**

Mr Smith reported that EPPO Council had strongly urged its members to support full implementation of the work programme of the ICPM, and the present funding proposals made by the Director-General of FAO. He hoped that other RPPOs would similarly urge their members. Mr Pemberton stressed that it was particularly important, in the ICPM, for “developing countries” to make these points. Mr Lopian informed the meeting that an analysis had been made of financial needs of the IPPC Secretariat and recommendations had been made by the FAO Council for 36% increase of the IPPC budget from the biannual base of 2.000.000 USD. The Chairman concluded that the proposal had the general support of the Technical Consultation, which decided to declare to the ICPM that it noted with satisfaction that the FAO Council had agreed to support a substantial increasing in funding for the IPPC Secretariat in the 2004/2005 biennium and urged the RPPOs, through their member countries (and particularly developing member countries), to maintain strong support for this increase in the appropriate FAO bodies until it can be finalized at the FAO Conference in 2003.

## **6. Matters concerning new or existing ISPMs:**

### **6.1 Specification for an ISPM on phytosanitary requirements for consignments in transit**

Mr Smith presented a draft specification of an ISPM on "Phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit", and proposed EPPO as a collaborator for this project. Mr McDonell said that NAPPO had been developing regulations for transit of fruits and vegetables originating in Mexico to Canada through the territory of the USA. The Vice-Chairman, Mr Hilali and Mr Jones noted that there were many problems with transit of plant consignments in Africa. Mr Arocena also supported the necessity of the standard. It was noted that the standard should include measures to protect the countries of transit. There was some discussion on wood packaging accompanying consignments in transit, but it was concluded that ISPM № 15 adequately covered this case.

The Technical Consultation approved, with minor modifications, the draft specification prepared by EPPO for an ISPM on Phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit. It recommended to the ICPM that this ISPM should be developed, with high priority. It proposed the draft specification to the IPPC Secretariat as a basis for the work of the Standards Committee.

### **6.2 ISPM no. 15 on wood packaging (EPPO Council resolution)**

Mr Smith reported that EPPO Council had concluded that ISPM no. 15 was in force, despite problems with the logo included in the mark to be made on treated packaging. It urged EPPO countries to apply the standard, and accept wood packaging treated according to the Standard. Mr Pemberton noted that, finally, ISPM № 15 had not been suspended, but only recommended to be suspended, by the IPPC Secretariat. Mr de Hoop noted that the greatest problems arose in the USA, where the ownership of the logo had direct consequences. Mr Lopian reported that a new logo was being developed by FAO, in secrecy, and was likely to be approved in 2003.

The Technical Consultation recommended RPPOs to encourage their members to continue steps towards implementation of ISPM no 15, and to accept wood packaging material marked as recommended in ISPM no 15, without use of the symbol which was agreed as part of the mark, if necessary.

### **6.3 Citrus canker**

Mr Arocena explained that the management of citrus canker was a serious problem for citrus-exporting countries in South America. The ICPM was proposing to develop a standard on surveillance for citrus canker, but COSAVE considered that it was more important to develop a broader standard on integrated measures for management of citrus canker. Mr McDonell supported the development of such a standard. Mr

Lopian noted that the main problem was how correctly to group all standards on citrus canker. Mr Pemberton agreed that the main aim would be to develop a general a package of standards on citrus. Mr Smith added that EPPO had several specific standards on citrus canker, but aimed to put these together into a commodity standard for citrus fruits.

The Technical Consultation recognized the concerns of COSAVE in proposing a specification for an ISPM on integrated measures for citrus canker. It suggested that the draft ISPM on surveillance for citrus canker, currently forming part of the ICPM standards programme, should first be completed, and supported the further development of ISPMs for citrus canker, including integrated phytosanitary measures.

#### **6.4 Areas of low pest prevalence**

Mr McDonell reported that NAPPO was working towards the development of a standard on low pest prevalence, and presented a concept paper drafted by Mr J.M. Zavala of Mexico. In Mexico, there are specific pest-free areas for fruit flies, managed so as to allow exports of fruits to USA. The Mexican NPPO has established that there are much larger areas in which the same fruit flies may be present but at very low prevalence. Management of these areas as "Areas of low pest prevalence" (ALPP) in the sense of the SPS agreement, opens further possibilities for export, supports the management of pest-free areas, and opens the possibility of considerably extending pest-free areas. Mr McDonell explained that, when the pest population exceeds the defining threshold in an ALPP (according to monitoring data), control measures are taken to reduce the population below the threshold level, whereas in a pest-free area any detection of the pest causes the area to lose its status. Mr Ivess reported that such an approach had been found very useful for fruit flies in Australia.

The participants discussed at some length what measures were appropriate for an ALPP. It was noted that, according to the risk, different countries could require different thresholds within the ALPP, take different actions when thresholds are exceeded, delimit ALPPs differently, require buffer zones or not. Some participants considered that all such points would have to be settled by bilateral agreement, and doubted whether an international standard was needed.

Although, as Mr de Hoop stressed, there was no guarantee of freedom from pests for consignments originating in ALPP, several participants envisaged that this approach could find many applications in plant quarantine. Mr Foliaki saw that bilateral agreements would often be needed for the management of ALPPs, but did not understand why this should prevent the development of an international standard. The same situation arose for pest-free areas and for pest-free places of production, both of which were covered by ISPMs. Mr McDonell said that, in any case, NAPPO would continue to develop this standard as a regional one.

The Technical Consultation concluded that it was greatly interested in the NAPPO concept paper on the application of areas of low pest prevalence, and strongly supported it. It recommends to the ICPM that an ISPM on this subject should be developed and encouraged NAPPO to develop a draft specification.

### **7. Problems in the development and use of ISPMs:**

#### **7.1 Complexity of language**

Mr Foliaki explained that PPPO countries found the language used in ISPMs to be too complex, to the extent that this could become a major obstacle to their implementation. Mr de Hoop thought that standards had to be developed internationally at a high technical level, but then implemented nationally. NPPOs had the responsibility to make standards clear to their staff. However, the Chairman was convinced that better international understanding would be achieved if ISPMs were kept short and written in clear and simple English. Their translation would also be much simplified. Mr Jones explained that the IPPC Secretariat was concerned how to respond to this problem and presented an FAO document suggesting that the Standard-setting Procedure should include editorial steps to address the issue of language complexity.

The Technical Consultation thoroughly discussed the question of where the complexity arose and who should be responsible for reducing it. Messrs Pemberton and McDonell stressed that certain standards deal with subjects which are complex because of their technical nature, and that these should not be simplified if this alters their meaning. Subject to this constraint, the original authors of draft standards should make themselves understood simply and clearly. Mr Lopian thought that the texts of all standards tend to become more and more complex, and even ambiguous, as they are revised. Complexity should not provide an excuse for ambiguity of interpretation. So the last version of a standard should in particular be simple and clear. According to different participants, the problem could best be solved by giving responsibility to the IPPC Secretariat, to the Standards Committee, to the stewards of standards, or to some special editorial sub-committee. In any case, the responsible bodies had to have editorial skills and their work should not unduly delay the development of standards. Mr Pemberton stressed that the pressure of time was one of the main reasons why ISPMs were not sufficiently clear and simple. If, with adequate funding and staffing, working groups could spend more time finalizing their proposals to the Standards Committee, and the consultation process could allow in due measure for comments of substance and comments on style and wording, better results could be expected.

The Technical Consultation finally urged participants in working groups, and stewards appointed for each standard, to ensure that language used in standards is clear and simple. The Technical Consultation also urged participants in the Standards Committee to ensure that language used in draft ISPMs is clear, simple and focussed, and strongly suggested that this is added to its functionse.

## **7.2 Language and interpretation problems**

Mr Arocena presented a COSAVE document stressing that the exclusive use of English in ICPM working groups discriminated against the effective participation of experts from many countries. The Technical Consultation considered whether the provision of simultaneous translation for working groups was a feasible solution, but concluded that it was difficult to develop texts in more than one language at a time, that simultaneous translation of technical subjects could create as many problems as it solved, that the cost was high, and that it would be even higher if all the FAO official languages were used (there being no reason to favour any in particular). However, both Mr Shen (APPPC) and Mr Wandenberg (CAN) recognized the problem raised by COSAVE. Mr Smith reported that EPPO uses two official languages (English and French), and the EPPO Secretariat provides consecutive translation when necessary. However, it is only able to work on documents in one language, and would find it impossibly expensive to provide all working documents in two languages. Mr Arocena supposed that the increase of IPPC budget should permit simultaneous translation between at least two languages. It was noted that, during the course of the meeting of the Technical Consultation and the Inspectors' Workshop which followed it, speakers were able to use Spanish and French as well as English, by judicious combination of the spoken language with the language used on-screen, and by use of consecutive summarized translations provided by persons from various RPPO secretariats.

The Technical Consultation concluded that the language barrier reduced the capacity for, and effectiveness of, expert participation in Working Groups, interfering with their aim of preparing globally acceptable standards. The Technical Consultation recommended that the IPPC Secretariat and Working Group chairmen ensure flexible arrangements are made to allow full participation of Working Group members (use of any FAO language, provision of summary oral translations). The Technical Consultation also recommended that, where appropriate, FAO languages other than English should be used as the primary language for a Working Group (and included in the specification).

## **7.3 Adoption of ISPMs at country level**

Mr Arocena presented a COSAVE document demonstrating that the complexity of ISPMs is blocking their implementation at national level, that the development of international standards serves no purpose if they are not implemented, and that the ICMP should have a strategy in support of implementation. Mr Shen shared concern. Mr Wandenberg reported that Comunidad Andina was translating ISPMs and inserting them into national regulations. Mr Lopian noted that one of the functions of RPPOs was to help countries to

apply ISPMs. He added that the Dispute Settlement body of the ICPM would discuss how far ICPM members are maintaining or introducing phytosanitary measures which are in conflict with ISPMs. Mr McDonell stressed that it was necessary to focus on the implementation of ISPMs, and Mr Ivess recalled that countries could only implement standards if they were clearly expressed and, if appropriate, adequately translated.

The Technical Consultation took note of the concerns of COSAVE on implementation of ISPMs. It suggested that this point should be an agenda item for the next session of the ICPM. It encouraged RPPOs to design work programmes to assist their members in the implementation of ISPM.

## **8. Regional and international standards:**

### **8.1 Request from ICPM Chairman on specific standards**

The Technical Consultation was informed of the circulation to all ICPM members and RPPOs of a request from the Chairman of the ICPM (Mr. F Canale) to provide lists of specific standards for consideration in the ICPM programme. Mr Smith suggested that specific global standards could most readily be based on existing regional standards produced by different RPPOs.

The Technical Consultation noted that the Invitation by the Chairman of the ICPM to propose a list of specific standards to the ICPM was addressed to the RPPOs, as well as to ICPM members. It recommended the RPPOs to consult among their members, as appropriate, and make proposals to the IPPC Secretariat before the stated deadline.

### **8.2 Development of 2 new regional standards by APPPC**

Mr Shen reported on the development of two APPPC Regional Standards on "Heat disinfection of fruit fly from host commodities" and "Training of plant quarantine inspectors". He explained that they would eventually be published on the APPPC website. He stressed that many Asian and Pacific countries remain free from many fruit fly species.

The Technical Consultation welcomed the initiative of the APPPC to develop Regional Standards.

### **8.3 Proposed new treatment standard of PPPO**

Mr Ivess reported that an HTFA (high temperature forced-air) treatment standard had been developed by Australia for fruit flies, and would now be proposed as a PPPO Regional Standard. Further details would be provided at the next Technical Consultation.

### **8.4 NAPPO standards and work programme**

Mr McDonell presented a NAPPO document reviewing the NAPPO standards and outlining plans for further development of standards by the NAPPO Panels. All standards, and Panel reports, were available on the web site [www.nappo.org](http://www.nappo.org).

### **8.5 EPPO's programme for regional standards**

Mr Smith presented an EPPO document explaining the content of the different sets of EPPO Regional Standards and providing a detailed catalogue of Standards on phytosanitary measures. He explained that implementation of EPPO Standards is not mandatory, but that very many EPPO standards are adopted in national regulations, and in particular recognized within EU Directives.

### **8.5 Development of ISPMs from regional standards**

The Chairman noted that a discussion on this point had been added to the agenda. Mr Lopian explained that the ICPM standard-setting procedure allowed for this possibility, without specifying any particular mechanism. Mr Arocena recalled that COSAVE was now proposing a standard on integrated measures for citrus canker, because it considers this to be very important. Participants discussed the circumstances in which it would be appropriate to propose a regional standard for conversion into an ISPM. It was noted that, on the one hand, RPPOs sometimes develop a new regional standard specifically as a means of promoting the global adoption of an equivalent ISPM, while on the other hand, RPPOs have in hand many regional standards developed only for local reasons but which could serve a wider purpose. Mr Lopian noted that there is a possible clash between the wish of RPPOs to promote regional standards and the ICPM's prioritization of its own standards. Resources did not allow regional standards, however well prepared for conversion into ISPMs, automatic access to the Standards Committee's agenda. He wondered whether RPPOs would expend their own resources to make proposals which were not certain to be accepted. Mr Pemberton, seeing the question from the other side, supposed that the ICPM should not use its own resources to develop a new international standard from zero when it could simply adjust an existing regional standard. It was noted in any case that present targets of 4 ISPMs per year left little room for regional standards, unless they were allowed some sort of fast-track procedure.

The Technical Consultation, noting the regional standard-setting process established by RPPOs and in particular the large number of standards already developed by some RPPOs, invited the ICPM to indicate a procedure for the development of regional standards into international standards within the ICPM priority programme. In this respect, and recalling the recommendations under points 6.1, 6.3 and 6.4, the Technical Consultation invited COSAVE to draft an international standard on the use of integrated measures for citrus canker for the 15<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation.

The Technical Consultation further recommended to RPPOs that they make use of the regional standards prepared by other RPPOs, adapted where necessary for application by their members.

## **9. Consequences of the revised CBD guiding principles: action points & terminology**

Mr Smith briefly presented an EPPO document reviewing current EPPO activity on phytosanitary risks to biodiversity. He proposed to present this question in more detail to the next Technical Consultation. Messrs Ivess and Foliaki suggested that a similar presentation on GMOs would be useful. Mr Smith explained EPPO could not provide this because it did not have responsibility in Europe for any standard-setting on GMOs. He hoped that another RPPO could put forward such a document.

## **10. Next Technical Consultation**

The Chairman reported that he had received a proposal for the next Technical Consultation to be held in Fiji in October 2003, at the invitation of PPPO. This would be consistent with the policy of rotation of Technical Consultation meetings. Mr. Suma declared that NPPO of Fiji would be glad to show that they could apply the ISPMs. Mr Ashby noted that all participants agreed Fiji as the place of the next Technical Consultation. He proposed to hold this meeting on the first week of October 2003 beginning from the 29<sup>th</sup> of September. The Technical Consultation agreed.

## **Close**

The Chairman noted that a full report of the Technical Consultation would be prepared after the meeting. Recalling that it was important for agreed recommendations to reach the IPPC Secretariat as soon as possible to be presented as a document for the ICPM, he asked the participants to review a set of recommendations prepared by the rapporteurs during the course of the meeting. After some discussion and modification, a final version of these recommendations was agreed (Appendix I).

The Chairman also asked that the report should include a table of action points, as was done in the report of the 13<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation. This is presented as follows:

Topic	Action	RPPO	Date
Support for IPPC Funding	Urge Members to support at FAO level	All	Through 2003 up to Nov.
Implementation of ISPMs	Develop action programme with members and report at 15 <sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation	All	By 15 <sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation
Specific ISPMs	Propose list of pest- or commodity-specific standards to IPPC Secretariat	All	Feb 2003
Wood packaging	Recommend Members to accept packaging carrying mark without symbol	All	Immediate
Integrated measures for citrus canker	Prepare a draft standard	COSAVE	By 15 <sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation
Areas of low pest prevalence	Prepare a draft specification	NAPPO	By 15 <sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation
Transit	Finalize draft specification for presentation to IPPC Secretariat	EPPO	Jan 2003

The Chairman thanked the Vice-Chairman and the Technical Consultation participants for their active participation. He declared the meeting closed.

**Recommendations of the 14<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation among RPPOs****Point 2.1** Role and functions of the Technical Consultation

The Technical Consultation notes the concerns of the IPPC Secretariat about the future role and functions of the Technical Consultation in relation to the activities of the ICPM. It presents to the ICPM a document (below) recalling the past activities of the Technical Consultation and proposing its future role. It invites the ISPM to

- endorse the continuation of Technical Consultation meetings on a yearly basis (preferably in October), with participation of the IPPC Secretariat
- make proposals for the annual programme of the Technical Consultation within the framework of the Work Programme of the ICPM.

**Point 2.2** NEPPO

The Technical Consultation urges all IPPC Contracting Parties in the Near East Region that are not yet parties to the NEPPO Agreement to ratify, or accede to, the Agreement as soon as possible so that it can rapidly come into force and NEPPO can become an active RPPO. The Technical Consultation stresses that the existence of NEPPO will greatly facilitate phytosanitary cooperation between the countries of the Near East Region and that their phytosanitary interests and concerns can, as appropriate, be represented by NEPPO at future Technical Consultations and other international meetings. The Technical Consultation also urges the ICPM to support the development of NEPPO.

**Point 3** Methyl bromide

The Technical Consultation welcomed the consultant's paper prepared for the IPPC Secretariat on "The future of methyl bromide for quarantine and preshipment applications", and agreed in principle with its conclusions, taking into account the sovereign right of countries to meet their obligations under the Montréal protocol. In a lengthy discussion, the Technical Consultation noted:

- the lack of alternatives to methyl bromide which continues to be problematic despite many research initiatives in the past few years
- the need for technical justification of existing phytosanitary uses of methyl bromide
- the fact that availability of methyl bromide is likely to be progressively more limited in future, whether for reasons of cost and supply, or through the further application and development of the Montréal Protocol.

The Technical Consultation noted the work programme which was proposed by the IPPC Secretariat for promoting the minimization of phytosanitary uses of methyl bromide and generally supported its main elements. It suggests that the elements concerned with alternative in-transit treatments and with reducing the incidence of emergency action fumigation should be more specifically focussed on methyl bromide. It proposes that, where the work programme proposes new ISPMs, these should be integrated into the general standard-setting programme of the CIPM with provision that the points relating to methyl bromide should be adequately addressed in them. It strongly suggests that the ICPM should identify the issues of immediate importance which should be made known to the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel of the Montréal Protocol in 2003, by preparation of a special document. It encourages phytosanitary authorities in regions and



countries to establish closer contact the authorities responsible for the Montréal Protocol, in order to promote the ICPM policy on methyl bromide. These recommendations are made with reservations from one RPPO.

**Point 4** PRA for low-risk situations

The Technical Consultation noted COSAVE's proposal for a supplement to ISPM no 11, to clarify PRA procedures in the case where low mobility pests are carried on fruits and vegetables in international trade. It concluded that this case is already adequately covered by the text of ISPM No 11, but noted that failure to implement ISPM No 11 adequately was giving rise to the application of unnecessarily restrictive measures for this pest/commodity combination. It drew the attention of the ICPM to this problem.

**Point 5** Funding of the IPPC Secretariat

The Technical Consultation noted with satisfaction that the FAO Council had agreed to support a substantial increasing in funding for the IPPC Secretariat in the 2004/2005 biennium and urges the RPPOs, through their member countries (and particularly developing member countries), to maintain strong support for this increase in the appropriate FAO bodies until it can be finalized at the FAO Conference in 2003.

**Point 6.1** Transit

The Technical Consultation approved, with minor modifications, the draft specification prepared by EPPO for an ISPM on Phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit. It recommends to the ICPM that this ISPM should be developed, with high priority. It proposes the draft specification it to the IPPC Secretariat as a basis for the work of the Standards Committee.

**Point 6.2** ISPM no 15

The Technical Consultation recommends RPPOs to encourage their members to continue steps towards implementation of ISPM no 15, and to accept wood packaging material marked as recommended in ISPM no 15, without use of the symbol which was agreed as part of the mark, if necessary.

**Point 6.3** Integrated measures for citrus canker

The Technical Consultation recognizes the concerns of COSAVE in proposing a specification for an ISPM on integrated measures for citrus canker. It suggests that the draft ISPM on surveillance for citrus canker, currently forming part of the ICPM standards programme, should first be completed, and supports the further development of ISPMs for citrus canker, including integrated phytosanitary measures.

**Point 6.4** Low pest prevalence

The Technical Consultation examined with great interest the NAPPO concept paper on the application of areas of low pest prevalence, and strongly supported it. It recommends to the ICPM that an ISPM on this subject should be developed and encouraged NAPPO to develop a draft specification.

**Point 7.1** Complexity of language

The Technical Consultation urges participants in working groups, and stewards appointed for each standards to ensure that language used in standards is clear and simple. The Technical Consultation also urges participants in SC to ensure that language used in draft ISPMs is clear, simple and focussed, and strongly suggests that this is added to the functions of the Standards Committee.

**Point 7.2** Use of FAO languages

The Technical Consultation noted that the language barrier reduces the capacity for, and effectiveness of, expert participation in Working Groups, interfering with their aim of preparing globally acceptable standards. The Technical Consultation recommends that the IPPC Secretariat and Working Group chairmen ensure flexible arrangements are made to allow full participation of Working Group members (use of any FAO language, provision of summary oral translations). The Technical Consultation also recommends that, where appropriate, FAO languages other than English should be used as the primary language for a Working Group (and included in the specification).

**Point 7.3** Implementation of ISPMs

The Technical Consultation took note of the concerns of COSAVE on implementation of ISPMs. It suggested that this point should be an agenda item for the next session of the ICPM. It encouraged RPPOs to design work programmes to assist their members in the implementation of ISPM.

**Point 8.1** Suggestions of specific standards

The Technical Consultation noted that the Invitation by the Chairman of the ICPM to propose a list of specific standards to the ICPM was addressed to the RPPOs, as well as to ICPM members. It recommended the RPPOs to consult among their members, as appropriate, and make proposals to the IPPC Secretariat before the stated deadline.

**Point 8.2** APPPC Regional Standards

The Technical Consultation welcomed the initiative of the APPPC to develop Regional Standards.

**Point 8.3** Development of regional standards

The Technical Consultation noted the regional standard-setting process established by RPPOs and in particular the large number of standards already developed by some RPPOs. It invites the ICPM to indicate a procedure for the development of regional standards into international standards within the ICPM priority programme. In this respect, and recalling the recommendations under points 6.1, 6.3 and 6.4, the Technical Consultation invites COSAVE to draft an international standard on the use of integrated measures for citrus canker for the 15<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation.

The Technical Consultation further recommends to RPPOs that they make use of the regional standards prepared by other RPPOs, adapted where necessary for use by their members.

## Role and Functions of the Technical Consultation

### Document prepared at the 14<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation as the outcome of point 2.1 of the Agenda

#### Background

Prior to the existence of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM), the Technical Consultation of RPPOs was the sole international forum for discussion of phytosanitary matters. As such, the Technical Consultation of RPPOs was instrumental in the development of several of the early International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). In addition, the Technical Consultation of RPPOs played an active role in the revision of the IPPC and the plans for an ICPM. These activities are summarized in the following Table:

No.	Location	Host	Date	Special activity
1	Rome	FAO	Sep 4-8, 1989	Response to GATT initiative
2	Rome	FAO	May 14-18, 1990	Harmonized principles of plant quarantine
3	Rome	FAO	May 13-17, 1991	Possible international approval mechanisms for harmonized guidelines, recommendations and standards
4	San Salvador	OIRSA	May 11-15, 1992	Possibilities for harmonized phytosanitary procedures
5	Rome	FAO	May 17-21, 1993	Draft guidelines on PRA; proposal to create CEPM
6	Rome	FAO	May 16-20, 1994	Associated with first CEPM; glossary group
7	Nouméa (NC)	APPPC	Sep 4-8, 1995	Creation of PPPO
8	Paris (FR)	EPPO	Sep 10-13, 1996	Revision of IPPC
9	Brasilia (BR)	COSAVE	Sep 8-12, 1997	Priorities for ISPMs
10	Rome	FAO	Nov 9-10, 1998	Emergency response
11	Rome	FAO	Sep 29/Oct 1, 1999	Reporting obligations
12	San Diego (US)	NAPPO	Oct 11-13, 2000	Recognition of RPPOs; generic standards
13	Auckland (NZ)	APPPC	Oct 29-31, 200&	Methyl bromide, complexity of language
14	Marrakech (MA)	EPPO	Dec 9-11, 2002	See main report

#### Current situation

The Technical Consultation continues to be the most important point of contact between the RPPOs, which have no other opportunity to consult as a group. Since the establishment of the new revised text of the IPPC and the creation of the ICPM, the Technical Consultation has concentrated its objectives on its aims as stated in Article IX/4 of the IPPC:

- a) promote the development and use of relevant international standards for phytosanitary measures;

and

b) encourage inter-regional cooperation in promoting harmonized phytosanitary measures for controlling pests and in preventing their spread and/or introduction.

The new revised text of the IPPC also creates the concept of the Regional Standard on Phytosanitary Measures, their establishment being one activity of RPPOs to "achieve the objectives of this Convention" (Article IX/2, X/3).

Interest in the Technical Consultation remains high with 8 of the 9 existing RPPOs represented at the 14<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation held on December 9 and 10, 2002 in Marrakech, Morocco. The RPPOs representing developing countries stress the value of this opportunity for information exchange with other RPPOs.

Whereas the Technical Consultation previously met at FAO Headquarters in Rome, with the organizational support of the FAO Plant Protection Service and then the IPPC Secretariat, it has now taken steps to minimize the costs to the IPPC Secretariat. Since 1996, it has met only once in Rome, and the location of its annual meetings now rotates among the RPPOs. The individual RPPOs and host countries now provide secretariat support for the meeting, propose the agenda, distribute documents before the meeting and prepare the report after the meeting. The presence of a representative of the IPPC Secretariat remains necessary for overall coordination between the IPPC Secretariat, the ICPM and the Technical Consultation of RPPOs.

#### *Contribution of the Technical Consultation to the Work Programme of the ICPM*

The Technical Consultation is attended by experienced phytosanitary experts representing all regions of the world. In addition to its support for regional programmes under the IPPC, the Technical Consultation can contribute to the work programme of the ICPM as follows:

- identification of problems associated with the implementation of ISPMs and recommendations to the ICPM regarding their resolution;
- development of explanatory documents to support ISPMs;
- discussion of draft concept papers and regional standards for phytosanitary measures (RSPMs) and proposal of RSPMs as the basis for ISPMs (Article X/3);
- contribution to the standard-setting process
- support of the country consultation process of draft ISPMs,
- platform for identifying new phytosanitary priorities for standard setting
- supporting technical capacity building in developing countries.
- contributions to the achievement of the Programme of Work of the ICPM in alignment with Article IX of the IPPC.

**14th Technical Consultation between RPPOs  
14ème Consultation technique entre les ORPV**  
Marrakech (MA), 2002-12-09/11

**PARTICIPANTS**

FAO	J.E. JONES	FAO/AGPP, B762, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome (IT) 390/6 57052040 - 390/6 56347-jeffrey.jones@fao.org
<hr/>		
APPPC	R. IVESS	MAFF Biosecurity Authority P.O. Box 2526, Wellington (NZ) 64/4 474 4127 – 64/4 4989888
	V. PETPISIT	Botany and Weed Science Division, Department of Agriculture, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900 (TH) 662/5613445, 5790548 – 662/561 3445,5796744 - vichpet@doa.go.th
	C. SHEN	FAO/UN Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, 39 Phra Atit Road, Bangkok 10200 (TH) 66/26974268 – 66/26974445 – chongyao.shen@fao.org
<hr/>		
Comunidad Andina	C. A. WANDEMBERG	c.o CPU system La Nina 231, Quito (EC) - 593/2 2522865 – 593/2 2544860 – cwandemberg@andinanet.net
<hr/>		
COSAVE	G. AROCENA	Ministerio de Canaderia, Agricultura y Pesca, Direccion General de Servicios Agricolas, Millan 4703 CE 12.900, MONTEVIDEO (UY) garocena@mgap.gub.uy
<hr/>		
IAPSC	S.A.H. OLEMBO (Ms)	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council, B.P. 4170, Yaounde (CM) 237/2211969 – 237/2211967 – ahono-olembo@yahoo.com
	M. E. ZWEIGERT	c/o UA-CPI/GTZ, Harmonisation de la Politique Phytosanitaire en Afrique (HAPPA), BP 4170 Yaounde (CM) 237/2211970 or – 237/7706002 – 237/2215048 – GTZHAPPA@aol.com
<hr/>		
NAPPO	I. McDONELL	Observatory Cres., Bldg #3, Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Ontario K1A0C6 (CA) 613/7596132 – 613/7596141 – imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca
<hr/>		

OIRSA	J.J. MAY MONTERO	Calle Ramon Belloso, Fin. Pje. Isolde, Col. Escalon, San Salvador (SV) 503/2631123 – 503/2631128 – oirsa@oirsa.org.sv
<hr/>		
PPPO	S. FOLIAKI	Quarantine & Quality Management Division, Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry, PO. Box 14, Nuku’ Alofa (TO) 676/24257 – 676/24922 – sionefoliaki@msn.com / maf-qcmd@kalianet.to / sionefoliaki0@lycos.com
	S. SUMA	Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Private Mail Bag Service, Suva (FJ) 679/3379231 – 679/3370021 – sidneys@spc.int
<hr/>		
EPPO	R. ARNITIS	State Plant Protection Service, Republikas Laukums 2, Riga 1981 (LV) 371/7027098 – 371/7027302 – ringolds.arnitis@vaad.gov.lv
	S.J. ASHBY	DEFRA, Room 343, Foss House, King’s Pool, 1-2 Peasholme Green, York YO1 7PX (GB) 44/1904 455048 – 44/1904455198 - steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk
	M. CHOUIBANI	Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, des Contrôles Techniques et de la Répression des Fraudes, B.P. 1308, Rabat (MA) - 212/37 690375 - 212/37 297544 – chouibani@smirt.net.ma
	M. B. DE HOOP	Netherlands Plant Protection Service, P.O.Box 9102, 6700 HC Wageningen (NL) 31/317496629 - 31 (0)317 421701 - m.b.de.hoop@pd.agro.nl
	R. EL OUARD	Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, des Contrôles Techniques et de la Répression des Fraudes, B.P. 1308, Rabat (MA) - 212/37 771547 - 212/37 297544
	R. GROSBARDIS	SPPS Plant Quarantine Department, Pulkveža Brieza 17, Riga 1010 (LV) 371/7323676 – 371/7322039 – raivis.grosbardis@vaad.gov.lv
	A. HILALI	Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, des Contrôles Techniques et de la Répression des Fraudes, B.P. 1308, Rabat (MA) - 212/37 771547 - 212/37 297544 – ahilali@menara.ma
	V. HUYSHAUWER (Ms)	Ministère des Classes Moyennes et de l’Agriculture, Service qualité et Protection des Végétaux, Tour WTC/3- 6e étage, avenue Simon Bolivar 30, 1200 Bruxelles (BE) 32/2 2083701 – 32/2 22083705 – vera.huyshauwer@cmlag.fgov.be

R. LOPIAN Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Quality Policy Unit,  
Hallituskatu 5, P.O. Box 30, FIN-00023 Government (FI)  
358/9 160 52449 - 358/9 160 52443- ralf.lopian@mmm.fi

L. MILTOVICA SPPS South Kurzeme Regional Unit  
Vakarastr. 9, Kuldīga 3301 (LV)  
371/3322092 – 371/3322092

A.W. PEMBERTON Central Science Laboratory, DEFRA, Sand Hutton,  
York YO41 1LZ (GB)  
44/1904462222 – 44/1904 462250 – a.pemberton@csl.gov.uk

H. PAULSEN (Ms) Norwegian Agricultural Inspection Service,  
P.O. Box 3, 1431 Aas (NO)  
47/64944400 – 47/64944410 – hilde.paulsen@slt.dep.no

I. PITTOMVILS (Ms) Ministère des Classes Moyennes et de l'Agriculture, Service  
qualité et Protection des Végétaux, Tour WTC/3- 6e étage,  
avenue Simon Bolivar 30, 1200 Bruxelles (BE)  
32/2 2083729 – 32/2 2083705 - ilse.pittomvils@cmlag.fgov.be

J. PRIMAKA SPPS Plant Quarantine Department, Pulkveža Brieža 17, Riga  
1010 (LV)  
371/7324511 – 371/7322039 – juliza.primaka@vaad.gov.lv

M.A. RAHEL Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, des Contrôles  
Techniques et de la Répression des Fraudes, B.P. 1308, Rabat  
(MA) - 212/37 690670 - 212/37 297544

---

I.M. SMITH 1 rue Le Nôtre, 75016 PARIS (FR)  
33/1 45207794 – 33/1 42248943 – hq@eppo.fr

A.D. ORLINSKI 1 rue Le Nôtre, 75016 PARIS (FR)  
33/1 45207794 – 33/1 42248943 – hq@eppo.fr

## INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION

14<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation between RPPOsMarrakech (MA), 9<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> December 2002Agenda

1. Report of 13<sup>th</sup> Technical Consultation (tc13.pdf)
2. Present and future for RPPOs: situation of NEPPO (02-9863, 02-9890)
3. Future of methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment applications. Work programme (IPPC Secretariat) (02-9861, 02-9862, 02-9873)
4. Risk analysis for low mobility pests on products for consumption (COSAVE) (02-9876)
5. Funding of the IPPC Secretariat: EPPO Council resolution (02-9849)
6. Matters concerning new or existing ISPMs:
  - specification for an ISPM on phytosanitary requirements for consignments in transit (EPPO) (02-9852)
  - ISPM no. 15 on wood packaging (EPPO Council resolution) (02-9850)
  - Areas of low pest prevalence (NAPPO) (02-9856)
  - Citrus canker (COSAVE) (02-9878)
7. Problems in the development and use of ISPMs:
  - complexity of language (PPPO)
  - language and interpretation problems (COSAVE) (02-9877)
  - adoption of ISPMs at country level (COSAVE) (02-9875)
8. Regional and international standards:
  - request from ICPM Chairman on specific standards (02-9858)
  - development of 2 new regional standards by APPPC (02-9860)
  - proposed new treatment standards of PPPO
  - NAPPO standards and work programme (02-9874)
  - EPPO's programme for regional standards (02-9859)
9. Consequences of the revised CBD guiding principles: (02-9851)
  - action points
  - terminology
10. Next Technical Consultation (02-9857)